

**REMARKS:**

Claims 24-30, 33, 35-37, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72, and 75 were pending in this application. Claims 37 and 75 have been canceled. Claims 76-79 have been added. Claims 24, 29, 41-45, 48, 56, and 66 have been amended. Therefore, claims 24-30, 33, 35, 36, 41-45, 48-54, 56-63, 65-72, and 76-80 are pending in this application. Entry of the above amendments is respectfully requested.

Support for the amendments and new claims can be found throughout the specification including at least the following passages and figures: claim 2 as filed (element (j)); Figs. 7-11; page 12, last paragraph to page 13, first paragraph; page 14, last paragraph.

**Examiner Interview**

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for scheduling an Examiner interview for February 20, 2010, and regrets that the unexpected closure of the U.S. Patent and Trademark Office prevented the interview from being held as planned.

**Section 103 Rejections**

All pending claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Irons et al. (U.S. Patent Pub. No. 2002/0111960) in view of Altman (U.S. Patent 6,236,767), and in further view of Payne et al. (U.S. Patent 6,092,090). Without conceding the propriety of the rejections, Applicant has amended the claims to advance prosecution of the case.

*Claims Entitled to a Priority Date of At Least September 17, 2000*

Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 24 is entitled to a priority date of at least September 17, 2000, which is the filing date of U.S. Patent No. 6,775,422, issued from U.S. Application No. 09/665,188, to which this application claims priority as a continuation-in-part.

The chart below identifies detailed support for the current limitations of claim 24. Unless otherwise indicated, any emphases are added. Applicant furthermore notes that the support provided below is exemplary, and is not limited to these passages and/or figures.

CLAIM 24 ELEMENT(S):	EXEMPLARY SUPPORT IN '422 PATENT:
24. A method, comprising: receiving a succession of electronic documents into a computer system, wherein each of the succession of electronic documents is received at a corresponding point in time;	<p>The '422 patent discloses a “physical system” “and an electronic system.” See ‘422 patent at col. 4, lines 44-45. These systems “share a scanner 34” that “produce[s] sequences of electronic image documents 27 in sequences of date/time instances. <i>Id.</i> at col. 4, lines 46-48. A “[w]orkstation 86 is operatively connected to scanner 34” and “receive[s], from the scanner, data signals represented electronic image documents and their date/time identifiers.” See <i>id.</i> at col. 5, lines 50-59. See also Fig. 1A, reproduced below in part, elements 32, 33, 34, 35, 41, 45, 47:</p>
	<p><b>Fig.1a</b></p>

for each of at least a subset of the received electronic documents:  
the computer

See, e.g., col. 5, lines 50-55 (“Workstation 86 is operatively connected to scanner 34 for transmission to the scanner of control signals that synchronize the production of date/time instances, and that receive, from the scanner, data signals representing electronic image documents and their date/time identifiers.”). Also see col. 7, lines 47-50 (“The timing is arranged so that each electronic document ... is uniquely identified at the moment of its

system generating a corresponding unique time-based identifier identifying a date and time of day that the electronic document was received by the computer system;	acquisition or creation by entry of a date/time instance....")
the computer system storing, in a storage array,	<i>See, e.g., Col. 5, lines 49-50 ("electronic system 32 includes ... an electronic storage 88.")</i>
a respective plurality of attributes relating to the electronic document in each of a plurality of tables of a relational database accessible to the computer system,	<p><i>See col. 5, line 66 to col. 6, line 3 ("Electronic image documents 42 and electronic work documents 43 are assembled by electronic system 32 as a date/time sequence of electronic documents 47. Electronic documents 45 are assembled by electronic system 32 in a relational database 47....")</i></p> <p><i>See also Figures 11-13, showing Tables 1-3 (each having a plurality of attributes relating to electronic documents).</i></p>

TABLE 1									
Entry_	Date_Type	Entity_Code	Project_No	Doc_Bracket	Doc_Publish_	Doc_Author_	Subject_	Doc_	Account_
Code	Date	Number	Number	Text	Date	Source	Matter	WholePart	Location
	Entry Date/Term of term or last minimum lifetime data type								Electronic image or text documents - OLE object linking/embedding data type

Fig. 11

TABLE 2									
Entity_	Code	Entity_	Entity_	Entity_	Entity_	Entity_	Entity_	Entity_	Entity_
Code	Number	Number	Address	Info	Tel_No	Fax_No	Email	Refrence_	Refrence_
			Primary field in Table 2 Secondary field in Table 1						

Fig. 12

Table 3									
Project_No	Project_Kind	Project_Name	Security_Level	Approval_Term_Date/Time	Task_Entry_Date/Time	Task_Due_Date	Task_Done_Date	Review_Due_Date	Review_Done_Date
Primary field in Table 5 Secondary fields in Table 1									

Fig. 13

wherinc at least one of the plurality of tables includes the generated unique time-based identifier as one of its respective plurality of attributes,	Table 1 in Fig. 11 includes an “Entry_Date/Time” attribute.
wherinc the generated unique time-based identifier is usable to access each of the plurality of tables,	As shown, in Fig. 11, the “Entry_Date/Time” value is a primary key for Table. Furthermore, as shown in Figs. 12 and 13, there are “secondary fields” in Table 1 that are “primary fields” in Tables 2 and 3, respectively. Fig. 14 also discloses that Tables 2 and 3 are linked to table 1. <i>See also</i> '422, col. 7, lines 33-39 (“As will be seen in FIG. 14, the following relational links exist among Tables 1, 2 and 3 of FIGS. 11, 12 and 13, above. The Entity_Code MANY (secondary) field of Table 1 is linked to the Entity_Code ONE (primary) field of Table 2. The Project_No MANY (secondary) field of Table 1 is linked to the Project_No ONE (primary) field of Table 3....”).
and wherein at least one of the plurality of tables includes a first attribute containing information indicating a location of a physical document corresponding to the electronic document; and	<i>See</i> '422, col. 6, lines 42-43 (showing a “Physical_Storage_Location” field name).
the computer system accessing the plurality of attributes for the electronic document in at least one of the plurality of tables using the	<i>See</i> Fig. 3; col. 3, lines 36-41.

corresponding unique time-based identifier for the electronic document.	
---	--

Thus, as demonstrated above, claim 24 is fully supported by the disclosure of the ‘422 patent, and is therefore entitled to a priority date of at least September 17, 2000.

Applicant also respectfully submits that the above-identified support for claim 24 is applicable to independent claims 41, 48, and 56, and that those claims are entitled to a priority date of at least September 17, 2000. Thus, all independent claims are entitled to a priority date of at least September 17, 2000.

Numerous dependent claims are also entitled to a priority date of at least September 17, 2000, as their claimed elements are supported by the ‘422 patent. The support for the claims below is identified below relative to the ‘422 patent.

Claims 25, 43, 52, and 61 are supported by at least Tables 1 and 2 in Figs. 11-12.

Claims 26, 33, 42, 45, 49, 50, 51, 57, 58, 59 are supported by at least col. 7, lines 40-50, and/or col. 5, line 49 to col. 6, line 13.

Claims 27 and 60 are supported by at least col. 6, lines 28-29 and col. 7, line 65 to col. 8, line 2.

Claims 28, and 65-68 are supported by at least Figs. 1 and 1A, and col. 7, line 53 to col. 8, line 2.

Claim 29 is supported by at least col. 5, lines 6-46.

Claim 30 is supported by at least col. 5, line 60 to col. 6, line 1.

#### *The Altman ‘767 Patent and the Irons Reference Are Not Prior Art Under § 102*

The Examiner has cited the Altman ‘767 patent, which was patented on May 22, 2001. The Irons publication was filed on October 25, 2001. Because claim 24 and the other above-mentioned claims have a priority date of at least September 27, 2000, however, the Altman ‘767 patent and the Irons publication do not qualify as prior art under any provision of 35 U.S.C. § 102 with respect to those claims. Thus, the Examiner’s rejection of the claims above under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is moot. For at least the reasons above, Applicant respectfully requests

withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of all claims having a priority date of at least September 17, 2000 (*i.e.*, claims 24-30, 41-43, 45, 48-52, 56-61, and 65-68).

*The Cited Art Fails To Teach or Suggest Elements of Other Dependent Claims*

With regard to claim 35, Irons does not teach or suggest a “fourth of the plurality of tables [that] is configured to store a plurality of attributes relating to the physical document that corresponds to the given electronic document, wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical document.” Although Irons discloses “generat[ion]” of a “globally unique identifier for [a] paper-based document,” *see* Irons at para. 47, Irons does not teach or suggest the above-recited fourth table. The Altman ‘767 patent also does not teach a “fourth table” as recited. Applicant notes that the Altman ‘767 patent teaches, e.g., a “Table 1” and a “Table 2.” *See* Altman ‘767 at Fig. 4. Payne, although directed to, e.g., “systems and software for managing document processing in a business environment,” Payne at col. 1, lines 6-8, also fails to teach or suggest the above-recited limitations of claim 35 as that reference does not discuss a “fourth” table of a “relational database” “wherein an attribute in the fourth table includes a type of physical document.” (Emphasis added).

For at least the reasons above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejections of claim 35 and its dependents. For at least similar reasons, Applicant also requests withdrawal of claims 44, 53, 62, and their respective dependents.

Applicant also asserts that claim 36, which is a dependent of claim 35, is additionally patentably distinct from the art as it recites “a fifth of the plurality of tables [that] is configured to store a unique value for the given document, wherein the unique value is formed by a combination of a value of a first key of the first table and a value of a second key of the second table.” (Emphasis added). For at least similar reasons, claims 54, 63, and 69-72 are also believed to be additionally patentably distinct.

In summary, Applicant requests withdrawal of the § 103 rejections of all pending claims for at least the reasons discussed above.

*Newly Added Claims*

Claims 76-79 are also entitled to a priority date of at least September 17, 2000 as they are supported by the ‘422 patent in at least the following locations: col. 6, lines 28-29 (showing

Entry\_Date/Time as a primary field for Table 1). With respect to these claims, Applicant notes that the Altman '767 patent and the Irons publication do not qualify as prior art under any section of 35 U.S.C. 102.

**CONCLUSION:**

Applicant respectfully submits the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-72402/AAC.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 1, 2010

By: /Alex A. Courtade/  
Alex A. Courtade  
Reg. No. 65,635

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.  
P. O. Box 398  
Austin, Texas 78767  
(512) 853-8879